

**MINUTES OF
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2015**

PRESENT: Peter F. Murphy, Springfield District
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large
Janyce N. Hedetniemi, Commissioner At-Large
Ellen J. Hurley, Braddock District
James T. Migliaccio, Lee District
Julie Strandlie, Mason District
Earl L. Flanagan, Mount Vernon District
Timothy J. Sargeant, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District
John L. Litzenberger, Jr., Sully District
John C. Ulfelder, Dranesville District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:16 p.m., by Chairman Peter F. Murphy, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

COMMISSION MATTERS

Commissioner Hart announced that minutes for March and April 2015 had not yet been approved and were still under review. He also stated that John W. Cooper, Clerk to the Planning Commission, had distributed the minutes from May 2015 to July 2015 to the Commissioners. He then asked that the Commissioners review these documents and submit any necessary revisions to Mr. Cooper by October 15, 2015. Commissioner Hart announced his intent to move to approve these sets of minutes at the Planning Commission's meeting on Wednesday, October 21, 2015.

//

Chairman Murphy announced that Robert E. Simon, who made significant contributions towards the development of Reston, passed away on Monday, September 21, 2015, at the age of 101. He briefly reviewed Mr. Simon's personal history, saying that he had purchased the land on which Reston was later developed. He also noted that Mr. Simon frequently attended Planning Commission meetings for cases that involved Reston. Chairman Murphy then noted Mr. Simon's contributions to the overall development of Fairfax County.

Commissioner de la Fe noted his personal history with Mr. Simon, saying that he coordinated with him regularly on cases involving both Reston and other parts of the County. He also pointed out that Mr. Simon had helped coordinate with the Federal Government to reserve the land

necessary for the development of the Silver Line Metrorail system. He then echoed Chairman Murphy's remarks regarding Mr. Simon's contributions to the Planning Commission and the County.

//

On behalf of the Commission, Chairman Murphy congratulated Jennifer Garcia, Department of Planning and Zoning, and her family for the recent birth of her son, George Garcia.

//

SEA 87-L-012-02 – SPRINGFIELD BP

Commissioner Migliaccio MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEA 87-L-012-02, SPRINGFIELD BP, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF DECEMBER 9, 2015.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Lawrence, Litzenberger, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.

//

RZ 2015-SP-003 – CHRISTOPHER LAND, LLC

Chairman Murphy MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR RZ 2015-SP-003, CHRISTOPHER LAND, LLC, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF NOVEMBER 4, 2015.

Commissioner Hart seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Lawrence, Litzenberger, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.

//

SEA 97-M-016 – EXTRA SPACE STORAGE INC.

Commissioner Strandlie MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEA 97-M-016, EXTRA SPACE STORAGE INC., TO A DATE CERTAIN OF OCTOBER 7, 2015.

Commissioner Flanagan seconded the motion, which carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Lawrence, Litzenberger, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.

//

PCA 2004-PR-044-02 & CDPA/FDPA 2004-PR-044 – TYSONS CORNER PROPERTY HOLDINGS, LLC & TYSONS CORNER HOLDINGS, LLC (Decisions Only)
(The public hearing on these applications was held on September 17, 2015.)

(Begin Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Hart: Thank you Mr. Chairman. On September 17th, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on a combined Proffered Condition Amendment, Conceptual Development Plan Amendment, and Final Development Plan Amendment for the Tysons Corner Center, one of the most important commercial projects in the county. Staff was recommending approval but we deferred decision until tonight to work on language for some of the proffers. Revised language has been distributed to the Commission earlier this week with one additional change today to Proffer 52. I want to first thank the citizens who submitted correspondence and the speaker at the public hearing for their input. I want also to thank the applicant for its willingness to make constructive changes as the discussion has progressed. I also want to thank staff, particularly Suzanne Wright and Cathy Lewis, for their fine work on this case, as well as Mike Wing in Supervisor Smyth's office; and Beth Teare and Pam Pelto in the County Attorney's Office for their assistance on a very complicated package. I'm still pinch hitting for Commissioner Lawrence, who cannot be with us tonight, but he's followed the progress of this case and also has been involved with suggestions about the proffers. I hope that I'm handling the case consistent with how he would, with the help of capable staff. These applications are generally consistent with the previous do-over of the Tysons Corner Center, but reflect some refinements consistent with market changes and corresponding changing needs of the community. This package retains the strengths of the previous approval, but also accommodates the applicant's wishes to stay ahead of the curve for future phases. The first phase of the development has been successful and I believe these future phases will meet that high standard. The McLean Citizens Association had submitted some thoughtful comments to which the applicant responded in detail by letter, dated September 15, which has been distributed to the Commission. I wanted to touch on the resolution of several points. In a nutshell, the grocery store proffer is no longer needed in 2015 because of changes in the neighborhood since 2007, including additional grocery options and the commitment to make certain staples available to residents. The applicant also has an excellent track record of providing successful retail options as the market dictates. At Commissioner Lawrence's suggestion, there is an additional commitment to facilitation of grocery delivery options to the residents. I'm also satisfied that, although a commitment to an earlier construction for the childcare would be desirable, there is not necessarily a suitable location for an outdoor play area, except where the applicant has requested it. I'm also satisfied that the demand in the market for childcare options will be met by the applicant as it is feasible. On the affordable housing issue, the applicant is not requesting any additional density over the 2007 approval, which was heavily negotiated. And I would remind the Commission that this case is not coming in under the newer PTC Zoning where expectations might be different, but instead the PDC category. If the applicant had applied for PTC, they might be requesting more density and the PTC expectations might be applicable. As to the commitment for police support, the applicant has already been providing significant resources, including space in the mall for eleven officers, parking spaces, and other support, as well as significant security presence in the area. Regarding the super-street concept, the applicant has already made significant contributions to transportation infrastructure in excess of ten-million dollars and, including Route 7 widening, land for the Metro station bus phase is currently improving the International Drive

intersection and Route 123 and is committed to additional financial contributions of \$3 million and will be participating in the super-street discussions as they progress in the years ahead. I believe that – I believe I lost a page here, which had some positive observations regarding other issues that had been addressed including the pedestrian bridge and some other good things.

Commissioner Murphy: In all elegance.

Commissioner Hart: Yes, which – we're now – poor Jake – isn't going to have to stay as late tonight typing this. Therefore, I believe that with the most recent changes to the proffers – both mentioned and which I haven't covered – the applications are ready to send along to the Board. The applicant has agreed to a proffer today, satisfactory to the County Attorney's Office, resolving the Route 7 dedication, which was the principle outstanding issue. And the other proffers have been edited and clarified. The applications have staff's support, with which I concur. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS THAT THEY APPROVE PCA 2004-PR-044-02, SUBJECT TO THE EXECUTION OF PROFFERS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED SEPTEMBER 24, 2015.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of that motion? Ms. Hurley.

Commissioner Hurley: Overall, an excellent package – an extreme amount of work has gone into it. I am still concerned, along with the McLean Civic Association, about the child care center – that there is no minimum size set. I understand there's a concern about the play space, but this is the new urban environment. There are places – ways to put children – child care centers in urban environments. It's supposed – a place to work, live, and play. We need to have the child care so I will abstain from the motion. Overall, it's a tremendous package, but because of that one little detail I don't think has been fully – thoroughly satisfied, I will abstain.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. For all those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve PCA 2004-PR-044-02, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Ms. Hurley abstains. Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Secondly, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE FDPA 2004-PR-044, SUBJECT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' APPROVAL OF PCA 2004-PR-044-02.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Discussion? All those in favor of the motion to approve FDPA 2004-PR-044, subject to the approval of the Proffered Condition Amendment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hart: Finally –

Chairman Murphy: Is there an abstention to that one? Or are you going with – oh, okay. All right. Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Finally, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE THE MODIFICATIONS AND WAIVERS, AS LISTED IN THE OMNIBUS HANDOUT, DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2015.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of that motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you.

(The first motion carried by a vote of 8-0-1. Commissioner Hurley abstained. Commissioners Lawrence and Litzenberger were absent from the meeting.)

(The second and third motions carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Lawrence, Litzenberger, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

SEA 84-M-012-02 – QUAN Q. NGUYEN & NGAN T. NGUYEN (Decision Only)

(The public hearing on this application was held on September 17, 2015.)

(Begin Verbatim Transcript)

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, tonight we are back to make a decision on SEA 84-M-012-02 on Mr. Nguyen. Dr. Nguyen, if you would come down, please – come down to the podium. The – everyone should've received a memo this afternoon from staff, further explaining that the legislative history of the Comprehensive Plan – so I won't go into that. I'll go ahead and make my statement and then affirm the conditions. So we'll go ahead. Tonight, we're back to make a decision on SEA 84-M-012-02 – Dr. Nguyen's application to

build a new professional medical office on the same site where his practice has been located since 1984. His medical office is currently housed in a single-family dwelling built in 1941 and is the sole remaining one-story detached structure that remains on this street. The professional office is allowed under a previously-granted Special Exception. He seeks – seeks a special exemption to continue this use in a new structure. Last week, following the staff report and public hearing, several Commissioners voiced concern with language in the long-ago enacted Comprehensive Plan. The Plan language states that professional offices could be maintained in existing – emphasis added – structures, provided that these structures and their lots retain their single-family residential appearance. There’s a question of whether the Comprehensive Plan Amendment should’ve been amended to allow this use since the medical practice would no longer be housed in an existing structure. This section of Evergreen Lane, which is substantially commercial, has a long history in planning, zoning, and construction. In addition to the information included in the previously-published staff report, staff prepared a planning history akin to a legislative history, if you will, that provides additional background information on this plot. The memo was circulated among Commissioners and submitted for the record. As explained by staff, after careful consideration, that determine was – a determination was made that, despite the word, “existing,” the stability of the neighborhood was better-served by maintaining the current Plan language. The staff’s position was that the word, “existing,” does not hold as much importance as the stated intent of the plan, which is to provide for transitional uses in the area and to protect adjacent residential uses from commercial development. Further, the word, “existing,” was used to ensure conformity with a neighborhood, as it existed in 1984. I agreed with the staff determination in this case and plan to move for approval. I believe that the new residential-looking professional office will more closely conform to the existing neighborhood look and feel than the existing 1941 one-story dwelling. There will be no change in existing use. The building will continue to house a medical practice, which serves the community – and, in particular, a senior center located steps away. The structure will continue to provide a transition between the three – and perhaps four – residences on the south side. In fact, with new buffering and a fence, the transition should be improved. The Mason District Land Use Committee reviewed the application twice. And the only concern was making sure the building maintained a residential appearance. That was accomplished in both the drawings and the conditions. And there is no community opposition that I know of to this application. Therefore, I’d like to ask the applicant to confirm the conditions for the application.

Quan Nguyen, Applicant/Title Owner: Yes. I confirm that the building architecture shall generally conform to the conceptual building elevations included on Sheet 4 of the SEA Plat and exterior materials shall be of high quality – no vinyl siding – and compatible with neighboring residential properties.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you. Would you identify yourself for the record, please? Give us your name so we’ll know that-

Mr. Nguyen: Yes. My name is Quan Nguyen and I am the owner of the property.

Chairman Murphy: Okay. Thank you very much.

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you.

Commissioner Strandlie: And that is on the memo dated September 24th, correct?

Mr. Nugyen: Yes. Yes.

Commissioner Strandlie: Thank you. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SEA 84-M-012-02, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS SET FORTH IN THE MEMO DATED SEPTEMBER 24TH, 2015.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Hart: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Murphy: Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you. I appreciate the level of effort that has gone into the justification of staff's conclusion following the public hearing, but I still cannot agree with it. I think in a situation where we have extraordinarily specific Plan text, we run the risk of seeming arbitrary when, out of expediency or whatever other justification, we disregard Plan text like this. We make a lot of people jump through a lot of hoops for all kinds of applications. A lot of people need Plan Amendments or they have to, as we've seen, file FDPAs for patios in P-Districts and things. And it becomes difficult to tell the next person that comes along with a – with a good application with a positive use that benefits the community with an attractive building – that is just simply not in conformance with what the Plan text calls for. A situation like this where we have an existing commercial use, which is expressly authorized in an existing building – we have an application to expand the size of the building by four or five times and expand the parking area adjacent to undeveloped residential, which hasn't come in yet. This application should've had a Plan Amendment and I think most applications like this – staff would insist on a Plan Amendment. Once we take this new approach, it becomes very difficult to say no to the next people. I recognize, also, that may be an unintended consequence of some of what's happened with Fairfax Forward. We've made it very difficult for people to get a Plan Amendment – or a Plan Amendment in any reasonable amount of time. And I sense that under the – those types constraints, it makes it more important to single out certain cases and, perhaps, look the other way when we have Plan text saying no. I think that's a very bad idea. I think we're going to have problems justifying that to the citizens and we ought not be doing that. So I won't be able to support the motion. And I would agree with Commissioner Ulfelder's comments – he's not here tonight – Commissioner Ulfelder's comment at the previous hearing. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Murphy: Further discussion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SEA 84-M-012-02, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed?

Commissioner Hart: Abstain.

Commissioner de la Fe: I'll abstain.

Chairman Murphy: And the Chair abstains. And Mr. de la Fe abstains.

Commissioner Flanagan: One more.

Chairman Murphy: And Mr. Flanagan abstains – not present for the public hearing. The motion carries. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Strandlie: I also have one further. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE THE WAIVERS AND CONDITIONS LISTED IN THE STAFF REPORT, which also was distributed to you on a sheet DATED SEPTEMBER 17TH, 2015.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Ms. Hedetniemi. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Same abstentions. Okay? Same abstentions. Thank you very much.

(Each motion carried by a vote of 5-0-4. Commissioners de la Fe, Flanagan, Hart, and Murphy abstained. Commissioners Lawrence, Litzenberger, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

Secretary Hart established the following order of the agenda:

1. AF 2015-SP-001 – HEATHER SCOTT-MOLLEDA, JOSÉ MARIA MOLLEDA
2. CSPA 86-C-029-11 – BRANDYWINE OPERATING PARTNERSHIP, L.P. (Hunter Mill District)
3. SE 2015-MV-007 – FELECIA HAYES, SARATOGA LEARNING CENTER
4. SE 2015-BR-011 – JAYE S. BAWA
5. RZ/FDP 2010-PR-022 – TMG SOLUTIONS PLAZA LAND, L.P.

This order was accepted without objection.

//

The first public hearing was in the Springfield District; therefore, Chairman Murphy relinquished the Chair to Vice Chairman de la Fe.

//

AF 2015-SP-001 – HEATHER SCOTT-MOLLEDA, JOSÉ MARIA MOLLEDA – Appl. authorized by Chapter 115 (County Code), effective June 30, 1983 to permit the creation of an agricultural and forestal district. Located at 6500 Clifton Rd., Clifton, 20124, on approx. 23.17 ac. of land zoned R-C and WS. Tax Map 75-1 ((1)) 3. SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Commissioner Murphy asked that Vice Chairman de la Fe ascertain whether there were any speakers for this application. There being none, he asked that presentations by staff and the applicant be waived, and the public hearing closed. No objections were expressed; therefore, Vice Chairman de la Fe closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Murphy for action on this case.

(Begin Verbatim Transcript)

//

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Any Commission comments? Hearing and seeing none, I'll close the public hearing. This is in the Springfield District – Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner Murphy: Thank you very much. Are the Molledas here? No, they're not. Well anyway, I want to thank them for dedicating about 24 acres in Springfield to the Agriculture and Forestal Area. This is their initial application for a four-year Agriculture and Forestal District. It is in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance and so forth. And so forth – and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE AF 2015-SP-001 AND AMEND APPENDIX F OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY CODE TO ESTABLISH THE MOLLEDA LOCAL AGRICULTURE AND FORESTAL DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO THE ORDINANCE PROVISIONS DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2015, WHICH ARE CONTAINED IN THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Any discussion? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Vice Chairman de la Fe: Opposed? The motion carries. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Murphy: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Lynskey.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Lawrence, Litzenberger, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

At the conclusion of the case, Chairman Murphy resumed the Chair.

//

CSPA 86-C-029-11 – BRANDYWINE OPERATING PARTNERSHIP, L.P. – Appl. under Sect. 12-210 of the Zoning Ordinance to amend the previously approved Comprehensive Sign Plan associated with RZ 86-C-029 to permit sign modifications. Located on the N.W. side of Sunrise Valley Dr., approx. 800 ft. S. of its intersection with Dulles Corner Dr. and approx. 600 ft. N. of its intersection with Dulles Corner Ln., on approx. 40.15 ac. of land zoned PDC. Tax Map 15-2 ((2)) 2, 3, and 4; 15-4 ((1)) 1B1 and 1B2; and 15-4 ((2)) 6A. DRANESVILLE DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

In the absence of Commissioner Ulfelder, Commissioner de la Fe asked that Chairman Murphy ascertain whether there were any speakers for this application. There being none, he asked that presentations by staff and the applicant be waived, and the public hearing closed. No objections were expressed; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner de la Fe for action on this case.

(Begin Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy: Without objection, the public hearing is closed. Mr. de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Yes, could I have the applicants come forward, identify himself, and agree whether he agrees to the development conditions contained in the staff report.

Scott Adams, Applicant's Agents, McGuireWoods, LLP: Good evening, I'm Scott Adams with McGuireWoods on behalf of the applicant, and we agree with the development conditions.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you very much.

Mr. Adams: Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Mr. de la Fe.

Commissioner de la Fe: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, this is a – it's interesting that Mr. Ulfelder was not here because this case, when it was originally presented, was in the Hunter Mill District. This is the part of the Hunter Mill and Dranesville Districts that change – it seems every 10 years we trade precincts. And during these – these 10 years, it's in the Dranesville District, but Mr. Ulfelder wasn't here so I'm handling it. Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVE CSPA 86-C-029-11, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS DATED SEPTEMBER 9TH, 2015, WHICH ARE CONTAINED IN THE STAFF REPORT.

Commissioner Hart: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Hart. Is there a discussion of that motion? All those in favor of the motion to approve CSPA 86-C-029-11, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Lawrence, Litzenberger, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

SE 2015-MV-007 – FELECIA HAYES, SARATOGA
LEARNING CENTER – Appl. under Sects. 6-105, 6-106, and 8-
305 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a home child care facility.
Located at 8047 Winding Way Ct., Springfield, 22153, on approx.
15,639 sq. ft. of land zoned PDH-3. Tax Map 98-1 ((4)) 542.
MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Felicia Hayes, Applicant/Title Owner, reaffirmed the affidavit dated August 24, 2015.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Carmen Bishop, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of application SE 2015-MV-007.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response: therefore, he noted that a rebuttal statement was not necessary. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Flanagan for action on this case.

(Begin Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy: The public hearing is closed. Mr. Flanagan.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Oops. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I – we didn't have any testimony, either in favor or opposed. But you all received an email yesterday from the neighbor of Ms. Hayes that indicated that he has been bothered by parking, evidently, from the current users of the daycare center. And so, consequently, he has been informed that his remedy will be to – make that any violations of the conditions – I just want to be sure that the owner's aware that we have a condition that all drop-off and all pick-ups must be on the property and not on the public street, particularly in front of Mr. – I think his name is Thomas – Mr. Thomas' address. And I want to be sure that the operator is aware that he has the telephone number and the name of the Zoning Enforcement Officer and it will be up to him if he has any concerns in the future. So I want to be sure that you're aware of that tonight. Is that – are you aware of that?

Felecia Hayes, Applicant/Title Owner: Yes.

Commissioner Flanagan: You are? Yes, if you'd come forward.

Ms. Hayes: Yes sir.

Commissioner Flanagan: You are aware that-

Ms. Hayes: Yes.

Commissioner Flanagan: And I know he has no objection to the – your current, you know, use of the property in this regard. But he was concerned about increasing it up to 12 – whether that might, you know, trigger additional parking congestion that – so, consequently, he's going to be very observant of that. And I wanted to be sure that you're aware of that. And I'm satisfied that he has a remedy, you know, to take care of that particular condition. Okay?

Ms. Hayes: Okay.

Commissioner Flanagan: Thank you. While I'm there, the – the conditions were amended, as of this evening, to preclude the use of the underside of the deck by the daycare children. And you're aware of that? And you're in agreement with that-

Ms. Hayes: Yes sir.

Commissioner Flanagan: -that change to the conditions. And the other condition about the fact that they are not to have any use of the deck or the hot tub that's on that deck?

Ms. Hayes: Yes sir.

Commissioner Flanagan: Okay. Thank you very much. You can be seated.

Ms. Hayes: Thank you.

Commissioner Flanagan: With that, Mr. Chairman, I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL OF SE 2015-MV-007, SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS NOW DATED SEPTEMBER 23, 2015.

Commissioner Hedetniemi: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by – Ms. Strandlie? Who seconded?

Commissioner de la Fe: Hedetniemi.

Chairman Murphy: Oh, Ms. Hedetniemi. I'm sorry. All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the – is there a discussion of the motion?

Commissioner Sargeant: Mr. Chairman, can I-

Chairman Murphy: Yes.

Commissioner Sargeant: -ask one question for clarification?

Chairman Murphy: Sure.

Commissioner Sargeant: How does staff anticipation that the confirmation will come for the issues that have not been resolved yet?

Carmen Bishop, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning: The issues related to the electrical service panel has been resolved and the –

Chairman Murphy: We just lost the microphone.

Ms. Bishop: Sorry.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Ms. Bishop: Okay. I think we're back. There's no light bulb here – I just would like to note – to tell me whether or not the microphone is on or off. But anyways, the issues with the electrical service panel have been resolved. The hot tub and the deck inspections are pending and the applicant is actively working with our inspections department to see that through.

Commissioner Sargeant: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Murphy: Okay.

Commissioner Flanagan: And I also can add to that – that the applicant has been most diligent about pursuing these changes requested by the staff. It's been the staff that's been negligent in getting out there to confirm so I didn't want to delay getting to the –

Commissioner de la Fe: Not the current staff.

Commissioner Flanagan: Not the – not the – you know, well I – our electrical inspectors are the ones who have been – haven't had the opportunity to get back out there and make the final inspection. They were scheduled to go out on – before this meeting, but they're going to do it now after the meeting.

Chairman Murphy: Yes, Ms. Bishop almost fell off the chair over there. All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2015-MV-007, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much. Thank you, Ms. Hayes.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Lawrence, Litzenberger, Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

SE 2015-BR-011 – JAYE S. BAWA – Appl. under Sect. 9-610 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit a waiver of the minimum lot width requirements. Located at 5210 Dunleigh Dr., Burke, 22015, on approx. 1.71 ac. of land zoned R-2. Tax Map 69-4 ((14)) 45.
BRADDOCK DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Phil Parsons, Applicant's Agent, reaffirmed the affidavit dated August 3, 2015.

There were no disclosures by Commission members.

Joseph Gorney, Zoning Evaluation Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of application SE 2015-BR-011.

Mr. Parson said that the applicant would continue to reside on the subject property. He then pointed out that members of the applicant's family would reside within the dwelling unit that would be constructed on the subject property after it was subdivided. He also indicated that the purpose for subdividing the site was not part of a business or profit-seeking venture.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response: therefore, he noted that a rebuttal statement was not necessary. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Hurley for action on this case.

(Begin Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed. Ms. Hurley.

Commissioner Hurley: Thank you. Now, Mr. Chairman, I request the applicant to confirm, for the record, agreement to the development conditions dated 24, September 2015.

Phil Parsons, Applicant's Agent: We agree.

Chairman Murphy: Thank you, sir.

Commissioner Hurley: With the four new development conditions that were added today, the HOA has no objections to this application. The Braddock Land Use Committee unanimously recommends approval of this minimum lot width exception to subdivide this property. It's a fairly simple case overall. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I request that the applicant confirm – I'm sorry. I move – I already said that part – I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF SE 2015-BR-011, SUBJECT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS CONSISTENT WITH THOSE DATED SEPTEMBER 24TH, 2015.

Commissioner Migliaccio: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Migliaccio. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to recommend to the Board of Supervisors that it approve SE 2015-BR-011, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries.

(The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Lawrence, Litzenberger, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.)

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

RZ 2010-PR-022 – TMG SOLUTIONS PLAZA LAND, L.P. –
Appl. to rezone from C-4, SC, and HC to PTC, SC, and HC to
permit mixed use development with an overall Floor Area Ratio

(FAR) up to 5.33 and approval of the conceptual and final development plans. Located in the S.W. quadrant of the intersection of Westpark Dr. and Greensboro Dr., and N. of Solutions Dr., on approx. 18.10 ac. of land. Comp. Plan Rec: Transit Station, Mixed Use, Residential Mixed Use, and Park/Open Space. Tax Map 29-3 ((15)) 4D1, 4E1, 4F1, 4G, 7A1, 7B1, 7C1, and 7E1. (Concurrent with FDP 2010-PR-022.) PROVIDENCE DISTRICT.

FDP 2010-PR-022 – TMG SOLUTIONS PLAZA LAND, L.P. –
Appl. to approve the Final Development Plan for RZ 2010-PR-022 to permit multi-family, hotel, and retail use. Located in the S.W. quadrant of the intersection of Greenboro Dr. and Westpark Dr., on approx. 3.91 ac. of land zoned PTC, HC, and SC. Tax Map 29-3 ((15)) 7 A1, 7 B1 pt., 7 C1 pt., 7 E1 pt. (Concurrent with RZ 2010-PR-022.) PROVIDENCE DISTRICT. JOINT PUBLIC HEARING.

Elizabeth Baker, Applicant's Agent, Walsh, Colucci, Lubeley & Walsh, PC, reaffirmed the affidavit dated September 10, 2015.

Commissioner Hart disclosed that his law firm, Hart & Horan, PC, had a case where attorneys in Ms. Baker's firm were representing an adverse party. However, he noted that this matter and those parties were not related to this case and there was no business or financial relationship; therefore, it would not affect his ability to participate in this case.

Commissioner Hart announced his intent to defer the decision only for these applications at the conclusion of the public hearing.

Bob Katai, Zoning Evaluation Division (ZED), Department of Planning and Zoning (DPZ), presented the Staff Report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of applications RZ/FDP 2010-PR-022.

When Commissioner Hart asked about the timetable for the approval of the off-site athletic field, Mr. Katai indicated that the applicant had another pending application that included an athletic field and this application was scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on December 3, 2015.

Commissioner Hart asked staff for more information on subsequent developments on the subject property. Mr. Katai said that the applicant had a pending Final Development Plan application for Block C on the site and this application was currently scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on December 3, 2015.

Commissioner Hart asked about the status of the applicant's commitment to construct a library on the site, which was articulated in Proffer Number 65, Community Library. Tracy Strunk, Office of Community Revitalization (OCR), explained that OCR had coordinated with the applicant to incorporate a library into the proposed development, but noted that there were still

outstanding issues that had not yet been resolved, such as concerns over the parking provisions. She then added that the design of the library would be finalized on subsequent Final Development Plans (FDP), noting that Proffer Number 65 articulated the inclusion of features such as access from the parking garage and book drops. A discussion between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Strunk ensued regarding the timetable for resolving these outstanding issues wherein Ms. Strunk indicated that these issues would be resolved by October 4, 2015.

Commissioner Hart asked for more information regarding the traffic circulation and ingress/egress for the proposed grocery store on the site. Mr. Katai pointed out that the grocery store would be located on the northern portion of Block A and noted that this facility would be accessed from Greensboro Drive and Madison Street.

When Commissioner Hart asked how the grocery store on the site would relate to the retail street, Mr. Katai deferred to the applicant for more information on this issue.

Referring to Proffer Number 21, Noise Attenuation, as shown in Appendix 1 of the Staff Report, Commissioner Sargeant asked how the applicant's provisions to mitigate the noise impact on the site would be affected by the possible changes to the County's Noise Ordinance that were currently being considered by the Board of Supervisors. Catherine Lewis, ZED, DPZ, explained that Proffer Number 21 was crafted to be consistent with the Policy Plan's guidelines for noise attenuation, adding that the measures articulated in the proffer were intended to mitigate the impact of noise generated by highway traffic on the residents of the proposed development. She then pointed out that the County's noise ordinance pertained to noise impacts not related to noise generated by highway traffic. Subsequently, Ms. Lewis said that Proffer Number 21 would not be impacted by the changes to the noise ordinance that were currently under review.

Referring to Proffer Number 71, Condemnation Procedures, Commissioner Sargeant asked for additional information on whether the applicant would utilize condemnation for off-site parcels and what the subsequent impact of this process would be on neighboring parcels. Ms. Lewis deferred to the applicant for more information on this process, but indicated that staff had not identified any components of the subject applications that would require off-site condemnation. She added that staff had coordinated with the applicant and other neighboring property owners on developing the road network that would serve the proposed development and through this coordination, the need for condemnation would be unlikely.

Ms. Baker gave a presentation on the subject applications and during this presentation, she explained the following:

- The development of the proposal began in 2010 and had been subject to extensive review and numerous revisions;
- The proposed development would rezone 18.11 acres of the subject property to a PTC-District and approve an FDP for Block A and part of Block B, which would permit the construction of up to 685 resident units and 165,000 square feet of retail;

- The community that would be constructed under the proposed development would be called, “The Boro;”
- The subject property was located near the Greensboro Metrorail Station and was currently developed with four office buildings, three of which would be retained under the proposal;
- The existing office building referred to as the Enterprise Building, which was located near Greensboro Drive, would be removed to accommodate the proposed development;
- The existing office buildings on the site had already been modified to complement the Greensboro Metrorail Station, such as the installation of sidewalks and stairways;
- The proposed development would incorporate residential, commercial, and recreational uses onto the property in a manner consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s guidelines for a mixed-use development located near a Metrorail Station;
- The residential areas of the proposed development would be installed in Blocks A and B;
- The residential areas in Blocks A and B would include an entertainment center;
- The proposed development would feature a common green type urban park, as recommended by the Comprehensive Plan, and this feature would be located in the central portion of the site;
- The Conceptual Development Plan included two collector streets, Station Place and Park Avenue, as well as two local streets, Madison Street and Boro Place;
- The streets that would be installed under the proposed development would be consistent with the grid of streets that had been implemented with previously-approved developments in the area;
- The proposed development included a variety of building forms and heights to accommodate the necessary sidewalks and setbacks while maintaining an appropriate urban character;
- The building heights of the proposed development ranged from 75 feet to 400 feet;
- The heights of certain buildings were greater than the recommendations prescribed by the Comprehensive Plan, but the proposed development was still consistent with the Plan because there was sufficient flexibility in the text to accommodate the necessary features for the development;
- The proposed development was consistent with the Urban Design Guidelines provisions to create a distinctive skyline;

- The variety of building heights would create viewing corridors for residents and permit sufficient sunlight for the streetscape;
- The tallest buildings on the proposed development would be located on Block E, which included office developments with pedestrian connections to the Greensboro Metrorail Station, as articulated in Proffer Number 46;
- The community library that the applicant had proffered would be installed within one of the buildings that would be constructed on Block E;
- The majority of the retail development would be located along Boro Place, as shown on the FDP;
- The building materials of the buildings located along Boro Place would vary to improve the massing and visual impact of the development;
- The applicant had secured a lease from Whole Foods to construct a Whole Foods Grocery Store within the retail space in the proposed development, which would be accessed through Boro Place and the parking garage;
- The streetscape of Boro Place would accommodate a variety of retail outlets, which would be served by appropriate pedestrian paths;
- The proposed development included a theatre complex located near Greensboro and Solutions Drive, a lease for which had already been secured from Showplace Icon;
- The Common Green urban park that would be constructed under the proposed development would be called Magnetic Park;
- The features for Magnetic Park included approximately an acre of public park space and features such as an open lawn area, performance space, interactive fountains, kiosks, and outdoor games;
- The proposed development would include another park area known as Atrium Park, which would be an extension of Magnetic Park, and this park would feature play elements, seating, and other outdoor experiences;
- The proposed development would install a park facility on top of a parking deck known as Energy Park and this facility would include two multi-use courts, a playground, a jogging track, and seating area;
- The applicant had proffered an off-site athletic field, which would still be located within Tysons, and this field would be consistent with the Fairfax County Park Authority's (FCPA) standards for a full-sized field; and
- The off-site athletic field would be constructed before the second building was occupied.

In conclusion, Ms. Baker commended staff, the Commission, and the residents of the surrounding community for coordinating with the applicant on the subject applications. (A copy of Ms. Baker's presentation is in the date file.)

Commissioner Hurley asked how the proposed development would accommodate dog-walking. She also asked where child care services would be provided on the site and how children would be transported to nearby schools. Ms. Baker said that the residential buildings on the proposed development would accommodate pets, such as dogs, and indicated that there were areas to accommodate dog-walking. In addition, she stated that the park facilities included dog washing stations. Ms. Baker then pointed out that the proposed development included numerous facilities for children, such as a playground at Energy Park. She also noted that there would be interim uses that would accommodate similar recreational uses. In addition, Ms. Baker said that the residential buildings would accommodate children and while there was no designated child care facility, it was an approved use for these buildings. She added that the streetscape would accommodate school buses to transport children to the nearby schools.

When Commissioner Sargeant reiterated his concerns regarding the applicant's condemnation procedure, as articulated in Proffer Number 71, Ms. Baker echoed remarks from Ms. Lewis, stating that this procedure was unlikely to be utilized because the applicant had been coordinating with neighboring properties to secure the necessary parcels. She added that this proffer had been included as a standard practice. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Sargeant and Ms. Baker regarding the impact of Proffer Number 71 on neighboring parcels wherein Ms. Baker indicated that other cases in Tysons included a similar language regarding condemnation processes.

Commissioner Hart asked about the ownership and maintenance policies for the proposed park facilities. Ms. Baker said that the park facilities included in the proposal would contain public park easements and these facilities would operate in a manner consistent with other park facilities. In addition, she stated that the construction and maintenance of park facilities on the site would be managed by the Unit Owners Association for the proposed development. Ms. Baker also indicated that the applicant would coordinate with the FCPA to develop and manage these park facilities. When Commissioner Hart asked whether the FCPA supported the applicant's proposed policies for managing its park facilities, Andrea Dorlester, Senior Park Planner, FCPA, spoke in support of these policies, adding that the FCPA favored policies that encouraged private ownership and maintenance of park facilities in conjunction with public access easements.

A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Ms. Baker regarding the agreements with the County that would govern the library facility, vehicular circulation around the grocery store, and the ingress/egress for this grocery store wherein Ms. Baker said the following:

- The County favored utilizing a lease agreement to govern the library facility in the proposed development and this method was articulated in Proffer Number 65;
- The grocery store would be accessed by vehicles from Madison Street, which connected with Route 7; and

- The loading and unloading for the grocery store would be conducted in an area separate from the area utilized by customers of this store.

When Commissioner Hart asked about the possible need for condemnation of land to accommodate the necessary transportation improvements for Route 7, Ms. Baker stated that condemnation procedures would not be necessary because the applicant had made the necessary agreements to implement these improvements.

Commissioner Strandlie requested that the applicant provide additional information regarding child care services at the proposed development during the deferral period. She also suggested that the applicant study methods of providing child care services to the residents of the proposed development. A discussion between Commissioner Strandlie and Ms. Baker ensued regarding the importance of child care services and the presence of such services in urban environments wherein Ms. Baker said that the applicant would continue to study this issue.

Referring to language in Proffer Number 59, Workforce Dwelling Units (WDU), Commissioner Flanagan pointed out that the applicant reserved the right to enter into a separate binding agreement with the appropriate County agency regarding the terms and conditions of the administration of WDUs following the approval of the subject applications. He then said that similar language had been included in other applications, but this measure had not yet been implemented by an applicant. He then asked if there had been any instances where such a measure had been utilized and what the process was for implementing it. Ms. Baker stated that this measure had not been implemented in any of the applicant's prior developments. She then explained that this language of Proffer Number 59 was included to permit a process for the applicant and the County to craft a mutual agreement to provide the necessary WDUs to comply with this proffer. Ms. Lewis added that such an agreement would be subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Chairman Murphy called the first listed speaker and recited the rules for public testimony.

Mark Zetts, 6640 Kirby Court, Falls Church, representing the McLean Citizens Association (MCA), spoke in opposition of the proposal because the range of building heights for the proposed development was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He pointed out that two of the buildings depicted in the FDP had building heights of 340 and 310 feet, which was significantly greater than the maximum building height of 225 feet articulated in Tier 2 of the Tysons Comprehensive Plan Building Height Tiers. Mr. Zetts acknowledged that the Comprehensive Plan permitted additional building height to accommodate features such as workforce housing, but noted that the additional floor space that could be added beyond the maximum building height could not be greater than 20 percent. He then said that the applicant had not sufficiently justified the proposed building height. In addition, Mr. Zetts stated that the layout of the buildings in the proposed development was not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan's recommendations that taller buildings be located near Metrorail Stations. He also pointed out that the building heights for the tallest buildings in the proposed development were not consistent with the character of neighboring buildings. Mr. Zetts cited similar developments that sufficiently justified buildings of greater height by providing additional features, such as park facilities, and indicated that the applicant had not provided enough features to warrant the proposed building heights on the site. (A copy of Mr. Zetts' statement is in the date file.)

When Commissioner Hart asked about the vote the MCA had conducted for the subject applications, Mr. Zetts said that the MCA's vote had been unanimous in its opposition.

Commissioner Hart pointed out that due to the presence of existing office buildings on the site, the proposed development could not install the taller buildings near the Metrorail Station, as recommended by the Comprehensive Plan. However, he noted that the locations of the tallest buildings on the site would not incur a significant negative impact. A discussion ensued between Commissioner Hart and Mr. Zetts regarding the existing developments on the site, the heights of the proposed developments in relation to their proximity to the Metrorail Station, and the possible methods for addressing the MCA's concerns wherein Mr. Zetts acknowledged that the height of the existing office buildings were low, but noted the extent to which the building heights around these existing buildings varied.

When Commissioner Hart asked whether the MCA had expressed additional concerns about the subject applications other than to those pertaining to the building heights, Mr. Zetts said that the building heights were the MCA's only outstanding concern. In addition, he stated that permitting the proposed building heights on this site was inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and would set a negative precedent for future applications.

Commissioner Migliaccio asked staff to respond to Mr. Zetts concerns regarding the building heights of the proposed development. He also asked staff to provide additional information on how it was determined that the proposed building heights were appropriate. Brenda Cho, Planning Division, DPZ, explained that staff coordinated with the applicant on determining the building heights for the proposed development, saying that the location of the taller buildings on the site was sufficiently close to the Metrorail Station to warrant the height. In addition, she pointed out that previously-approved applications at neighboring sites had approved buildings of a maximum height of 330 feet, which was similar to the height of the taller buildings on the subject property. Ms. Cho also indicated that the Comprehensive Plan included language that gave flexibility to applicants seeking to install taller buildings, provided that these buildings were consistent with the appropriate urban design criteria, such as the inclusion of affordable housing and utilizing iconic architecture. She then said that the applicant's design for the proposed buildings was consistent with these criteria. Ms. Lewis echoed Ms. Cho's remarks regarding the Comprehensive Plan providing flexibility for applicants seeking to install buildings of greater heights, adding that this language was intended to facilitate development in the area. She then said that the design of the proposed development was determined to be sufficient to warrant the proposed building heights. Commissioner Migliaccio concurred with Ms. Cho and Ms. Lewis' conclusions regarding the flexibility provided by the Comprehensive Plan for building heights in the area, adding that such flexibility allowed applicants to design more visually appealing structures that could accommodate the necessary amenities.

Commissioner Flanagan commended Mr. Zetts for his testimony, but indicated that he did not agree with his conclusions. He explained that there were instances in a development where greater range of building heights was appropriate, citing developments in other urban areas like Chicago as examples. He then said that he supported the applicant's design for the buildings, noting that the variations in the design created more visually appealing development. Commissioner Flanagan also indicated that he supported staff's conclusions that the heights of

the buildings in the proposed development were appropriate. Mr. Zetts reiterated his concerns regarding the building heights not being consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Hedetniemi echoed remarks from Commissioner Flanagan regarding the design of the proposed development and the flexibility provided by the Comprehensive Plan for building heights, stating that she supported the applicant's design because it would improve the character and visual impact of the area.

When Commissioner Hurley asked whether the MCA had expressed any other objections to the proposal besides the building heights, Mr. Zetts stated that the MCA had expressed no further objections.

Chairman Murphy called for speakers from the audience, but received no response. There being no more speakers, Chairman Murphy called a rebuttal statement from Ms. Baker, who declined. There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Chairman Murphy closed the public hearing and, in the absence of Commissioner Lawrence, recognized Commissioner Hart for action on these cases.

(Begin Verbatim Transcript)

//

Chairman Murphy: Public hearing is closed. Mr. Hart.

Commissioner Hart: Thank you. Oh sorry – Mr. Chairman, thank you. We need a little more time on this, I think. I MOVE THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY FOR RZ 2010-PR-022 AND THE ASSOCIATED CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND THE DECISION ONLY FOR FDP 2010-PR-022 TO A DATE CERTAIN OF OCTOBER 7, 2015, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENT.

Commissioner Sargeant: Second.

Chairman Murphy: Seconded by Mr. Sargeant. Is there a discussion of the motion? All those in favor of the motion to defer decision only on RZ/FDP 2010-PR-022 to a date certain of October 7th, with the record remaining open for written comment, say aye.

Commissioners: Aye.

Chairman Murphy: Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

The motion carried by a vote of 9-0. Commissioners Lawrence, Litzenberger, and Ulfelder were absent from the meeting.

(End Verbatim Transcript)

//

The meeting was adjourned at 10:07 p.m.
Peter F. Murphy, Chairman
James R. Hart, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office,
12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Jacob Caporaletti

Approved on: May 18, 2016



John W. Cooper, Clerk
Fairfax County Planning Commission